



EIIP TELECONFERENCE MINUTES
Research Triangle Park, North Carolina
January 20, 1998

ATTENDEES

Steve Bromberg, Steering Committee
Tom Ballou, QA Committee
Bill Kuykendal, QA Committee
Chuck Mann, Area Sources Committee
Greg Stella, Projections Committee
Roger Westman, Steering Committee
Garry Brooks, ERG
Linda Cooper, ERG

GENERAL UPDATE

The status and progress of each of the working committees was reported on followed by a discussion of general interest items.

Point Sources Committee

Dennis Beauregard reported that the PSC had their last monthly call December 18 and their next call would be January 21. No one on their last conference call was interested in participating on the PM_{2.5} committee, but since then Jim Southerland expressed interest. (Note: During the January 21 teleconference, several PSC members expressed interest in joining the PM_{2.5} and Projections committees.)

Dennis also reported on the status of their documents. The chapter on oil and gas production is scheduled for external review in early February. Regarding the semiconductor manufacturing chapter, some committee members toured Motorola's facility in RTP to better respond to external review comments. The PSC prepared a summary memorandum to document responses to external review comments for the semiconductor chapter. Comment/response summary memoranda are also prepared for every chapter. The paint and ink manufacturing chapter is close to being finalized. They are also still working on the mining and quarrying document, which will be formatted differently from the others produced. Also, they are researching two more categories for which to develop guidance. ERG is currently conducting scoping studies on wood products (plywood), printing and graphic arts, and pulp and paper source categories.

In addition, Toch Mangat and Bob Betterton are still working on the Rule Effectiveness paper. Regarding personnel, they lost a committee member from Minnesota, but gained one from Allegheny County, Marty Hochhauser. Regarding their work assignment, the current one in place ends April 1.

Area Sources Committee

Chuck Mann reported on the activities for this committee. They finalized their chapter on pesticides. The chapter on petroleum vessel loading/unloading was sent out for external review, including the American Petroleum Institute (API), and extensive comments are possible. This committee had their conference call January 8 during which they reviewed what happened at the EIIP December conference. Their whole committee would like to receive copies of the conference minutes. When seeking volunteers for the new committees recommended at the conference, no one was interested, and the feedback received was that no new committees were needed.

Regarding outreach efforts, posting a list of frequently asked questions (FAQs) on the EIIP Web page was suggested, and they are compiling ideas for this. Also, they are preparing abstracts for categories for which there are no guidance documents. Chuck is preparing a strawman for one category as a representative sample. Steve Bromberg asked for clarification, and specifically would this become a chapter? Chuck responded that this effort was for categories for which no chapter was anticipated, since there were so many categories not covered in a full EIIP document--essentially a "quick and dirty" method. Steve also inquired about the committee's finances. Chuck answered that their work assignment has funds for a few months' work and would need to commit new resources when they are available.

Data Management Committee

In Lee Tooley's absence, Steve reported that this committee's work was going well. California put together an EDI-compatible file for the pilot project but had a problem with programming of the translator that they are working on and expect to be fixed in about 2 weeks. All of the old National Emission Trends (NET) system data has been moved to the new system (quick reports format). He added that the NET format should be finalized by the end of January and will be posted on the EIIP or Periodic Emission Inventory (PEI) Web page. There was a small problem they are resolving, and California is waiting for this to be corrected to regenerate their file. Pennsylvania is behind California by about 2 weeks.

Bill Kuykendal added some related information about data issues obtained through his efforts with the Western Regional Air Partnership. California is taking the lead on providing an emission inventory system for use by all states in the group. California has offered to make available to the group a scaled-back version of its California Emission Inventory Development and Reporting System (CEIDARS) as an emission inventory system. Dennis Goodenow made a presentation to the western States group on the EIIP DMC and its activities. Bill was not sure about its reception, but some chose to use the CEIDARS platform for work on SO₂ and visibility impacts. Also, he attended a meeting with representatives from Mexico regarding visibility and they may be interested in CEIDARS. Bill also reported that Environment Canada may use the EIIP data model and EDI. Several activities are underway that are related to data transfer issues. EIIP can feel good about this and our influence beyond our borders. When asked if the western states will standardize with the California system, Bill responded that we must wait and see.

OTHER BUSINESS

Budget

Steve reported that their FY98 funds were somewhere within the EPA organization but had not been located yet. He hopes to obtain the funds soon and begin discussions on the distribution of funds among the new and existing committees. Roger added that he had no news to report about FY99 funding from a negotiation session at a December STAPPA/ALAPCO meeting.

December 1997 Workshop

Steve noted that ERG has received EPA's comments on the draft workshop minutes and asked when the meeting summary would be ready for distribution. Garry Brooks responded that it should go to all meeting participants that week. Steve will do a cover memo and the draft summary will be posted on the EIIP website.

Emission Inventory Verification and Validation

Steve asked if this topic, raised at the December EIIP conference and the SAEWG meeting, would be reasonable for the QA Committee (QAC) to address. Dennis noted that no benchmarks were established and that having the QAC scope out alternatives would be good. Tom Ballou commented that there were not a lot of clear directions to pursue. Bill responded that possible courses of action would depend on how broadly these topics were defined and that they agreed with the QAC and its existing document defining QA/QC protocols to be used in emissions development. He asked if traditional QA/QC procedures would apply and work for validation and verification. He noted that DARS was a quantitative method to assess inventories, but the QAC did not do much to address nontraditional QA/QC methods. Bill added that the QAC could possibly do something above and beyond current guidance and that distinctions were important between monitoring data and inventory results. Items such as NO_x/VOC ratios and other ambient ratios could be investigated. Tom noted he had attended an inventory reporting workshop the previous week and the main questions posed were how good are the data and how good do they need to be, and added that EIIP should look at these topics and come up with new ideas. Steve said that is why he is suggesting the QAC address these and expects more questions because they clearly present different issues than classical QA/QC. He added that questions from EPA's global climate change groups were likely because they are looking at global emissions trading where emissions verification is crucial. Roger Westman said he could support work on these topics and added there were a number of ways to define them, e.g., internal vs. external audits. Tom said that he thought that overall this was a good idea. Bill noted he was working with the Western Regional Air Partnership who is forming an SO₂ emissions trading group. He said that they were now discussing handicapping emissions depending on how they were measured, such as were they estimated using an emission factor or continuous emissions

monitoring (CEM). Roger added that completeness and QA were important to both emissions and ambient measurement data.

Steve asked that participants think about this a month or two to determine if there were specific directions to pursue. Steve also recommended talking with Wiley Barbour at EPA's global climate change office that is preparing a white paper on the greenhouse gas perspective. Bill said he would reconvene the QAC to consider these topics and will try to come back with a writeup about what they determine and what to pursue.

New Committees

Regarding PM fine and projections, Steve reported he had been seeking volunteers and had posted a Web page item but that a notice did not get sent out on the listserver. One response was received from an Australian who asked if volunteers had to be in the United States. Some state and local agency people have volunteered but not enough. From EPA, Tom Pace has agreed to co-chair the PM_{2.5} work, and Greg Stella, the projections committee.

STEERING COMMITTEE

The next EIIP teleconference call was scheduled for Tuesday, February 24, at 3 p.m. EST. The call-in number is (919) 541-4248.



EIIP TELECONFERENCE MINUTES
Research Triangle Park, North Carolina
February 24, 1998

ATTENDEES

Steve Bromberg, Steering Committee
Cyril Durrenberger, Steering Committee
Herb Sherrow, Steering Committee
Roger Westman, Steering Committee
Chuck Mann, Area Sources Committee
Dennis Beauregard, Point Sources Committee
Bill Kuykendal, QA Committee
Tom Ballou, QA Committee
Tom Pace, PM-Fines Committee
Greg Stella, Projections Committee
Mohammed Mazeed, Projections Committee
Ron Ryan, SCC Subcommittee
Garry Brooks, ERG

GENERAL UPDATE

Steve Bromberg started the call by introducing some of the new co-chairs for the Projections and PM-fines Committees. Mohammed Mazeed of the Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control was introduced as the state co-chair for the Projections Committee. Tom Pace of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA's) Emission Factor and Inventory Group (EFIG) was introduced as the EPA co-chair for the PM-fines Committee. Reports on the status and progress of each of the working committees were given followed by a discussion of general interest items.

Area Sources Committee

Chuck Mann gave the report for the Area Sources Committee. He reported that the asphalt paving chapter was being revised and that a second draft would be available soon to the committee. Work on the wildfires chapter is proceeding on schedule and a first review draft to the committee should be provided in March. The open burning chapter is currently being evaluated by the committee. The petroleum vessel loading/unloading chapter has already been sent to external review and only one commenter has responded thus far. ERG will follow up with the other potential commenters and determine if more comments are forthcoming. The committee has discussed potential plans for FY98 funds but is waiting for the funds to be received before making any specific recommendations and plans. The committee has also been developing ideas for an "abstract" as an abbreviated type of EIIP guidance document (in place of full chapters) and for a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) forum. Examples of these items have been provided to

the other committees for review and discussion. These ideas are discussed in greater detail under the Other Business section of these minutes.

Point Sources Committee

The report for this committee was provided by Dennis Beauregard. The last committee conference call was February 18. Dennis commented that the current contractor support work assignment for the committee expires April 1; however, sufficient funds remain to continue working up until this time. He is working with Steve to find ways to get additional resources into the project before it expires.

Dennis reported that several items within the committee's program were nearing completion. The technical issue paper on Rule Effectiveness (RE) should be completed before the next co-chair call. The completed paper will be passed to the Steering Committee for review. The committee hopes to have ERG conduct a pilot study to investigate a few source categories to determine their patterns of process upsets, downtime, and control equipment malfunctions to gain a better real world assessment of how RE can and should be accounted for. The committee, primarily through the efforts of Ralph Patterson of Wisconsin, is developing a modified, condensed EIIP guidance document for stone mining and quarrying. This has been a sensitive category and Ralph has been working closely with the industry trade association to develop the material. The committee has also decided to develop a condensed guidance document for the printing and graphic arts category that will be an abbreviated EIIP document like the stone mining and quarrying document. The paint and ink manufacturing chapter is in the last stages of review and will be completed soon. The chapter on oil and gas production is currently out for external review. The plastics processing chapter is nearing completion for the external review step.

Projections Committee

The report for this committee was provided by Greg Stella. Greg indicated that the committee had not had any official meetings yet but there was certainly a lot of interest in the committee. They have about 10-15 members identified thus far. Cyril Durrenberger asked that a list of the membership of both the Projections and PM-fines Committees be distributed to everyone so the participants could be known. Steve said he would wait until after the first meetings of each committee to do this so they could see which current volunteers are really serious about participating. Greg indicated that the first activity of the committee now is to collect and evaluate existing documentation on projection methods. The committee wants to gain a good understanding of the different techniques currently available and in use for projecting emissions data.

PM-Fines Committee

Tom Pace provided the status report for this committee. Tom stated that one of the first goals of the group is to produce a state-of-the-science technical paper on estimation methods for direct and precursor emissions of PM-fines. Another goal of the committee, about which he wants input from everyone, is how should the area source model being developed by EFIG relate

to and address the PM-fines issue. Possible questions include what should the model user requirements be, what sources should be included, what capabilities should it have, etc. Tom noted that he has several volunteers for the committee but not good geographical representation. He also commented that several of the volunteers thus far are consultants and it may not be advisable to have them disproportionately represented on the committee. Tom hopes to have the committee formed by March 6 and to have the first meeting of the group the week after that. Steve asked if one of the first tasks of the committee would be to draft a committee work plan and Tom said yes. He hopes to obtain some contractor support and this would be one of the first tasks they would assist with.

QA Committee

The report for the QA Committee was given by Tom Ballou. The QA Committee is now beginning to discuss the topic of inventory data validation/verification (V/V). This topic represents a departure from the classical QA/QC mission the committee has pursued up to this point. A committee call was held on February 23 to discuss this topic and how the committee should proceed. Thus far, four ideas have surfaced as possible means to address V/V: correlation of emissions with ambient monitoring data, correlation of emissions with air quality modeling data, evaluation of actual estimates for a site using some remote sensing technique, and use of statistical methods. Currently, the group plans to produce a modest “white paper” on V/V and the possible use of these techniques to address it. The paper will gauge the feasibility of conducting V/V and the general interest within the EIIP to tackle the question. It will serve as a means to gain more specific guidance and direction from the Steering Committee on how to proceed further with V/V.

The comment was made that it may be necessary to alter the composition of the committee to more effectively address V/V. New members are probably needed. Steve, Cyril, Bill, and Tom all agreed on this point. Cyril said that some V/V work had been done in Texas related to the use of monitoring data and may be helpful. He will discuss the issue with his staff. Tom Pace commented that source-receptor modeling had been used for several years for V/V of PM emissions. Bill stated that this investigation is also likely to highlight knowledge/capability deficiencies and weaknesses related to monitoring and modeling among committee members.

SCC Committee

Ron Ryan reported on the activities of this group. The committee is currently drafting a document, described as an outline/white paper, to describe the nature of the work being conducted by the committee, what has been accomplished thus far, and where they plan to go. The paper will be submitted to the Standing Air Emissions Work Group (SAEWG) for review. Ron stated that he is about one week behind in his schedule for completing the paper, but he is working to have it finished by the end of February. Cyril added that it may be helpful to present something to SAEWG on V/V as well and the work done by Texas using monitoring data.

Data Management Committee

Steve Bromberg led the status discussion for this committee. Regarding the previous translator problem that had occurred with the electronic data interchange (EDI) transmittal of California's point source data, Steve reported that the data had been resent and appears to have been accomplished successfully. The data set is now in EFIG undergoing examination and work to get it into the National Emission Trends (NET) database. When it has been confirmed that all the point source data were successfully transferred and incorporated, they will request that California transmit their area and mobile source data. The committee is hoping to have a complete demonstration of the data transfer process by mid-March. Steve reported that there had been some delays with the data from Pennsylvania and that at best the project would only be able to get their point source data.

The committee has started to evaluate the Phase II Data Model and how the Phase I model would need to be altered to incorporate the additional Phase II elements. They are also re-examining the level of state interest in the use of EDI for data transmittal. Several states have indicated they will not be using EDI, and it may not make sense for the committee to invest a significant additional effort in supporting EDI. The development of the inventory database is coming along well, with a target system demo in mid-March. Currently, the database is being populated with existing NET data. The team is making sure the database will work and data will flow into it by either the EDI or NET format approaches.

OTHER BUSINESS

FY98 Funds

Steve reported that there were some FY97 EIIP funds that had not been spent that were now available for use in current EIIP projects. The contract Project Officer had been able to recover approximately \$70,000 of unused funds. Steve expects the funds to be used to support the Point Sources project and the QA Committee effort on V/V, and some will be allocated to the new Projections and PM-fines Committees to get them going. Steve also noted that there was little news to report regarding FY98 funds. We still do not have them. Apparently new EPA procedures have come into play that are tying up the release of the funds. A letter has been sent from STAPPA/ALAPCO to EPA requesting that the funds be released and spent but there has not yet been any movement on the funds. Steve will continue to closely monitor the situation.

EIIP Abstracts

Chuck Mann presented a brief discussion on a concept that the Area Sources Committee has come up with regarding the development of EIIP "abstracts." Abstracts are intended to be concise documents on emissions estimation guidance procedures that would serve to fill gaps for important categories where a full, detailed EIIP guidance chapter could not be developed for reasons of time, resources, or need. These abstracts would generally only be 2-3 pages long.

They would define the category covered, the pollutants emitted, the recommended estimation procedure, adjustments that may be needed, spatial and temporal allocation methods, and controls adjustments. Specific references would be provided. Use of references would be extensive to eliminate having to include a lot of information in the abstract, thereby making it too long.

Abstracts would not replace full, detailed EIIP guidance chapters; however, they could serve to augment them. For some source categories, only an abstract would be needed, whereas for others, perhaps both a full chapter and an abstract would be useful to have. The general consensus of the people who had reviewed Chuck's draft abstract was that it would be a useful tool. They liked what it covered and how the data were presented. A comment was made that including spatial and temporal allocation materials was useful because there is interest in many cases of getting finer resolution on estimates than just annual averages. Another comment made was that it may be useful to add to the general abstract format a section that provides a national emissions estimate for the category so that users could put their estimates into context and relative importance on a national basis.

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

Chuck Mann reported that the Area Sources Committee had come up with some FAQs that they felt needed to be made available in some forum for the inventory community. The group indicated that the issue of outreach and EIIP publicity had come up during the December 1997 workshop as a key need. The use of more FAQ-type publications would help serve this need. The Area Sources Committee had developed and submitted to the Steering Committee several such FAQs that they believed required attention. Example questions included "How do I know if EIIP procedures are approved for use in my inventory?" and "What do I use when data sources and methods are in conflict with one another?". The Area Sources Committee had envisioned that as such questions came up, the various committees could use ERG to help answer the questions and keep the materials current. The materials could be made available on a web site. Steve commented that something like this had been done last year for the 1996 inventory web site and these were fairly successful. Chuck noted that the use of a FAQ and answer system would require oversight and review by all of the EIIP, and asked if this is something the program wants to do. In discussing the issue, concern was expressed that some of the FAQs raised were more EPA policy issues and perhaps not items that the EIIP should take the lead on answering. Others indicated that EIIP guidance had already been sanctioned by EPA and there should not be a problem here. The discussion concluded noting that there was some useful purpose to having FAQs of the type described by Chuck, that states were just looking for some assurances when doing their 1996 inventory, and that the EIIP could certainly serve a useful purpose in answering questions like who do I call for these data or where can I go for this information.

STAPPA/ALAPCO

Roger Westman communicated to the group that STAPPA/ALAPCO is working on a resolution to send to EPA strongly requesting that significantly more resources be put into the development of PM-fines inventories. The resolution will indicate that more money than is currently earmarked will be needed by state and local agencies for such inventory work, and the additional resources will be required if state/local agencies are to complete their obligations and provide quality inventories.

STEERING COMMITTEE

The next EIIP co-chairs teleconference call was scheduled for Tuesday, March 24, at 3 p.m. EST. The call-in number is (919)-541-4328.



EIIP TELECONFERENCE MINUTES
Research Triangle Park, North Carolina
March 24, 1998

ATTENDEES

Steve Bromberg, Steering Committee
Tom Ballou, QA Committee
Dennis Beauregard, Point Sources Committee
Richard Bode, Area Sources Committee
Cyril Durrenberger, Steering Committee
Sheila Holman, PM-Fines Committee
Bill Kuykendal, QA Committee
Chuck Mann, Area Sources Committee
Mohammed Mazeed, Projections Committee
Tom Pace, PM-Fines Committee
Herb Sherrow, Steering Committee
Greg Stella, Projections Committee
Lee Tooly, Data Management Committee
Roger Westman, Steering Committee
Garry Brooks, ERG
Linda Cooper, ERG
Mark Saeger, PES

GENERAL UPDATE

Reports on the status and progress of active committees were given, followed by discussion of general interest items.

Area Sources Committee

Chuck Mann reported on the activities for this committee. They received industry comments on the external review draft of the chapter on petroleum vessel loading/unloading. EPA's Office of Research and Development (ORD) received information on emissions from burning barrels with household waste that may be included in the ASC open burning chapter. The first draft of the chapter on wildfires and accidental burning is about finished and ready for internal committee review.

Steve asked about the committee's finances. Chuck answered that they will probably survive till early June without more funds.

Point Sources Committee

Dennis Beauregard reported that the PSC had their last monthly call about a week ago. He noted that their contractor work assignment (WA) ends April 1; another WA is to start soon (in about 2 weeks) and he expects it to be up and running quickly.

Dennis also reported on the status of their documents. For the semiconductor manufacturing document, they are reviewing comments received from industry. The paint and ink manufacturing document, Chapter 8, has been finalized and is posted on the EIIP Website. External review drafts of Chapters 10 and 11 on oil and gas field production and processing and plastic products manufacturing, respectively, have been posted on the EIIP Website. Chapter 9 on secondary metals processing is now being revised for a final review. The stone mining and quarrying technical assessment paper is undergoing external review as well. They are close to finalizing this document and one of their committee members, Ralph Patterson from Wisconsin, has been assisting. Dennis noted this topic can be politically sensitive and the team preparing the document has done a good job addressing these concerns.

Regarding other work of this committee apart from their normal focus, Dennis mentioned the rule effectiveness (RE) paper produced by Toch Mangat with help from Bob Betterton from South Carolina. They are trying to make inroads on gathering additional information from state and local agencies on upsets and malfunctions from stationary sources. TNRCC has a database on reported upset conditions that Paul Brochi will review. Alice Fredlund will look at Louisiana's information to determine how adjustments were made to stationary source emissions using data they have collected. This is a pilot program the PSC is undertaking for one or two source categories to determine if this effort is worth pursuing on a larger scale. Cyril Durrenberger noted that inspection reports from several petroleum refineries were not in the TNRCC database and he would follow up to obtain the data on types of leakage, broken seals, and frequency of inspection. Cyril mentioned that they were finding that RE grossly overestimated emissions so they were examining some of the smallest divisible parts, such as emissions from upsets. Cyril will send information to Dennis. Dennis noted that the PSC was trying to determine how to adjust numbers to get actual emissions that had some linkage to process conditions. He agreed that selecting a term other than RE might be appropriate, a term that was not misleading, and he was using the term "adjustment factors."

Projections Committee

Greg Stella reported for this committee, which had its first conference call the previous week. They had a good turnout including one caller from Australia in spite of a 5 a.m. call-in time, and scheduled their next call for later for 7 a.m. for this participant. At this time they are not certain about what they hope to accomplish. They plan to look at existing documentation with the perspective of making recommendations about how to improve it. They had a lively discussion on RE. Toch Mangat offered his opinion and mentioned the Point Sources Committee paper. Greg reported that Steve has kept him informed, that Steve had given this committee some funding, and that they will write up a WA for contractor assistance. Their first teleconference meeting focused on topical discussions about projections, and members introduced

themselves and their interests. Some have over 20 years of experience and some are new to the field. Participants will start collecting relevant documents. They will have their contractor compile meeting minutes and make these available the following week. Steve noted that some committees took awhile to determine the direction of their work, he expected the same might be true here, and he was pleased about the number of new participants.

PM-Fines Committee

Tom Pace, the EPA co-chair, reported that he has had conversations with the state co-chair. They have not completed formation of the committee but hope to have members in place by the end of the following week and schedule their next meeting for a week or two after that. They have contractor support on board from PES, with Mark Saeger there on this call. As their first item of business, they have asked Mark/PES to document current procedures for point source categories for PM-fine emissions. They expect to assess weaknesses in techniques and identify areas for improvement. Tom added in their scope of work one additional item, to comment on the functionality and usability of the Area Source Emission Model (ASEM) for direct and precursor emissions. He wants this committee to review plans and outputs for ASEM. Their key output will be a white paper to assess the state of science on emission inventory tools. They hope to have a draft by late June or earlier so they can have meaningful discussion on the topic over the summer and finish by September, but they have not discussed this yet with the contractor. Tom envisions the commentary on ASEM to be ongoing, and expects to brief the committee on this model prepared jointly by PES and Pechan.

Tom reminded the call participants that Sheila Holman of North Carolina had agreed to serve as the state co-chair for the PM-Fines Committee. Sheila added that she was happy to serve as co-chair and with where the committee is at this stage. She looks forward to continuing the discussion on committee membership and hopes it is finalized by the end of the following week. Cyril asked Tom if he would be attending the SAEWG meeting and have an outline of the white paper by then. Tom responded that he will attend the meeting, but doubts he would have the outline by then or, if so, it would be very general. Steve recommended this group restate their mission on the EIIP Webpage, which would serve to focus their attention and prevent wandering too far from it.

QA Committee

Tom Ballou reported that their committee had little activity since the last co-chair call. He said Bill Kuykendal was going to speak with Steve about modest funding for a scoping document on validation/verification issues. Depending on where this goes, decisions on the makeup of the QA group may be needed, and this would be fall into the purview of the Steering Committee. Steve responded that with the current budget uncertainties, he had told Bill to write a WA with hopes that by their next call monies would be available to get the validation/verification scoping piece done.

Data Management Committee

Lee Toohey reported that the DMC had several activities underway. The electronic data interchange (EDI) prototype demonstration is in wrap-up mode. They had successful transmissions from California and Pennsylvania, and expect to start documenting the results and evaluating the performance soon. They have started Phase 2 activities by collaborating with another EPA office in Washington, DC, related to reporting requirements. The DMC has been focusing on the data model, and hope it will not be compromised and can be extended. The State of Arizona and Maricopa County are the current participants in the Phase 2 data model program. They will do peer review and add state and local agency perspectives.

The abstract for a paper the DMC hopes to present in June at the AWMA conference in San Diego was accepted. The paper is on the EIIP prototype demonstration and a case study. At the AIRS conference at the end of April, Lee, representing the DMC, will present results of the demonstration project. They are also preparing materials to have at the upcoming SAEWG meeting. Also, regarding funding, she anticipates an interruption or stall in support at the end of April if no new funds are in place.

Discussion followed that their main product is the EIIP data model, and that this is not just the work of EIIP, but of state and local agencies as well. Lee asked if the DMC should pursue Phase 2 work further. They do not want to produce something others will not use. She noted that their other main product is the EDI data transfer pilot. They developed a database and have used the data model in various ways. Phase 2 focuses on reporting requirements and does not get directly into the mode of transfer, which can be EDI or something else. They feel relatively assured about the focus on the data model and not jumping over it to achieve data transfer standards first. Roger Westman commented that there had not been a good enough selling job on the data model and EDI to fully judge the state/local response received thus far. Steve added that the program was still evaluating the initial reaction to its products but the Steering Committee needs to examine state agency acceptance and use issues more carefully.

OTHER BUSINESS

Funding

Steve reported that they are still working on EIIP funding for FY98, but no break in the budget impasse is seen for the moment. STAPPA/ALAPCO has approved the FY98 funding and has communicated to EPA their desire to have the funds spent on the EIIP. EPA in Washington then decided that 105 grant funds could not be spent on EPA contracts. Steve noted that the initial 105 grants crisis had passed, but now he is still trying to figure out how to get the funds released to the contract. Roger's letter was not enough. Many committees are literally limping along with carryover funds, such as the Point Sources, Projections, and PM-Fines Committees,

but these funds will run out soon. Herb asked what was different this year than in the past. Steve responded there was nothing obvious except for the new procedure from Washington about Section 105 funds that could be not spent on EPA projects. No one can tell him the new procedure. Steve has been following up about twice a week, said they know we are here, and unfortunately that is all he can say now.

STEERING COMMITTEE

The next EIIP teleconference call was scheduled for Tuesday, April 21, at 3 p.m. EDT. The call-in number is (919) 541-4328.



EIIP TELECONFERENCE MINUTES
Research Triangle Park, North Carolina
April 21, 1998

ATTENDEES

Steve Bromberg, Steering Committee
Roger Westman, Steering Committee
Herb Sherrow, Steering Committee
Dennis Beauregard, Point Sources Committee
Bill Gill, Point Sources Committee
Chuck Masser, Area Sources Committee
Greg Stella, Projections Committee
Bill Kuykendal, Quality Assurance Committee
Linda Cooper, ERG
Garry Brooks, ERG

COMMITTEE UPDATES

Reports on the progress and status of each of the working committees were presented by one of the co-chairs of each committee.

Point Sources Committee

The report for the Point Sources Committee (PSC) was given by Dennis Beauregard. He reported that the PSC had not conducted a committee teleconference since the last co-chairs meeting on March 24. There had been some contractor downtime due to the hours on the existing work assignment running out; however, that problem has been addressed now that the work assignment has been modified with a 2-month extension. A second modification will be made to the work assignment as well to include hours to continue work on Rule Effectiveness (RE). The RE work will focus on the effect of process upsets and malfunctions on emissions levels. The goal of this work is to develop some tools and guidance for state and local agencies to use in estimating emissions for processes operating under less than optimal conditions. Dennis commented that on the previous co-chair call Cyril Durrenberger had indicated that Texas had some data on storage tanks that he thought might be useful for the PSC's work on RE. He had said he would contact the right people in Texas and get the information to the PSC but nothing had happened. Bill Gill said he would check into this with Cyril and try to find out where the information was. Also, a comment was made that during the recent teleconference for the Projections Committee, the topic of RE was discussed and there was considerable interest in terms of potential impacts on emissions projections.

Area Sources Committee

The Area Sources Committee (ASC) report was given by Chuck Masser. Chuck started his report by asking about the status of the EIIP funding for FY98. He indicated that the ASC was low on funds and could not really initiate any new efforts due to the funding situation. In regards to ASC documents, Chuck reported that the chapter on petroleum vessel loading/unloading was basically completed. He also mentioned that the petroleum vessel chapter had been renamed, as a result of external review comments, to marine vessel loading, ballasting, and transit. Final comments from the committee have been received and incorporated on the open burning and asphalt paving chapters and these should go out soon for external review. Chuck indicated that if funding were not an issue the committee could start work on several method abstracts documents for minor categories. Ideas for categories that could be done and information on how to do them had been received from California, Delaware, Maryland, and Washington. Some of the categories identified for abstract development include oil and gas wells, wastewater treatment, residential heating, and auto burning.

Quality Assurance Committee

The report for this committee was given by Bill Kuykendal. Bill indicated that the only significant activity that the committee had underway was a small new work assignment to investigate the issue of emission inventory verification/validation. A work assignment has been issued for the preparation of a 5-10 page white paper on the topic. The purpose of the white paper is to identify the possible techniques that may be viable for verification/validation (such as comparison to ambient measurements) and to describe briefly how these would be applied. The goal is to provide focus on what is known about the techniques and enable the QA Committee to decide if any of the techniques are viable enough to be recommended to the Steering Committee for detailed study. The paper is due to be completed by the end of May.

Projections Committee

The Projections Committee report was given by Greg Stella. Greg noted that the committee had just had its monthly call on the previous day. The committee is still discussing its mission, scope, and direction. The topic of RE was discussed during the committee meeting using the Toch Mangat RE paper as a starting point for the discussion. The group exchanged views on the use and role of RE in connection with emissions projections. They also discussed issues such as other sources for growth factors and other tools that may be available for projections purposes. Greg noted that participation on the last committee call was good, but was about half as many attendees as the group's first call.

PM-Fines Committee

No members of this committee were present on the call so no report was made.

SCC Subcommittee

The report for this group was given by Steve Bromberg. Steve indicated that the committee is close to having several items produced in connection with a new Source Classification Code (SCC) system. He noted that he thought the new codes were going to be called PCCs but he was not completely sure what PCC stood for. An outline for the new coding system and how it will work is coming out soon and will be posted on the EIIP website. The committee will produce a crosswalk that links SCCs and Area/Mobile Source (AMS) codes with the new codes to be proposed. Steve is slated to give a presentation on the draft new system at the AIRS conference next week. In addition to the outline, the committee is also producing a large spreadsheet containing the new coding system and this too will be posted for review on the website. The committee hopes to have the system complete and final by the end of 1998 and begin full use of it for inventory data coding purposes in January 1999. After the full introduction of the new system, EPA will continue to support both the old SCC system and the new one for a time; however, no additional SCCs or AMS codes will be assigned.

Data Management Committee

Steve Bromberg also gave the report for the Data Management Committee (DMC). He indicated that the DMC has a lot of very good information up on its website. For example, information on the National Emissions Trends (NET) input format is available as well as a demonstration of the new NET database. A presentation of the NET system will also be made at the AIRS conference. A question was asked by Bill Gill about when reports from the system would be available. Greg Stella stated that this activity was currently underway. Data from the California and Pennsylvania uploads are undergoing troubleshooting and reports are in production. He speculated that reports suitable for evaluation are slated for release for the third week in May.

OTHER BUSINESS

FY98 Funding

Steve reported that the feedback within EPA is fairly positive regarding the funding problem. All the issues with applying the funds have supposedly been resolved and he expects that the funds will be made available to the contract any moment. The source committees should finish drafting their work assignments for the FY98 funds and get them in to him. Steve asked Chuck Masser to pass along to Chuck Mann and the rest of the ASC that the committee has FY97 rollover funds still remaining that are not tasked and attached to the contract yet. There is approximately \$20,000 available to the ASC. Chuck Mann needs to contact Steve about this.

Greenhouse Gas Committee

The group assembled by Wiley Barbour (EPA/Climate Change Division) to produce guidance for greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and sources would like to have its draft documents posted on the EIIP website for review. Steve asked if anyone had an issue with this and no one did. Wiley's group ultimately wants their documents to be released as EIIP guidance. Steve said he has made it clear that this will not occur until such time that the Steering Committee has reviewed the group's final products and approved them for release under the EIIP. Steve commented that when the GHG documents were final and approved, they would not be published under another large-scale hard copy printing, but would instead be included on the next CD-ROM that is generated for all EIIP guidance.

ISSUE OF THE MONTH

The issue of the month for this call was is there a need to maintain some kind of official background documentation file for EIIP chapters akin to what is done currently by EPA for AP-42 sections. Currently, no such documentation files are required to be kept for each EIIP product. Dennis Beauregard led this discussion. Dennis indicated that someone had called him recently asking for a copy of an obscure memo that had been used as a reference in an EIIP document chapter. This request prompted him to consider whether the EIIP needed to have a more formal system of background documentation files. When he had approached Steve on the question, Steve replied that he thought most of what was cited in the EIIP products was readily available, and if that was true, it may negate having to establish documentation files for EIIP products.

There was a discussion by meeting attendees on this issue with everyone agreeing that it is a good idea to make available items that are not readily in the public domain (e.g., EPA correspondence, correspondence from industry, items produced by consultants). There was not a clear consensus among the attendees, however, on what form and extent such background documentation should take. Roger Westman asked if there was not a good middle ground between providing nothing and providing files of every item cited in the documents. Chuck Masser responded that he thought there was such a middle ground. Chuck said the ASC tried to assemble its documents in such a way that as many official report and contract numbers as possible were included in the references to help users locate materials easily. The more difficult ones to retrieve are kept in a project file. More obscure items that are likely not in the public domain are often included in their documents as appendices.

Steve asked ERG to review the current slate of EIIP documents and determine the distribution of references cited with respect to their ease of retrievability. Further discussion of this issue will follow in subsequent calls as a more specific characterization of the cited references is known.

STEERING COMMITTEE

The next co-chairs call was scheduled for Tuesday, May 19, at 3 p.m. (EDT). The call-in number will be 919-541-4328.



EIIP TELECONFERENCE MINUTES
Research Triangle Park, North Carolina
May 19, 1998

ATTENDEES

Steve Bromberg, Steering Committee
Tom Ballou, QA Committee
Bill Kuykendal, QA Committee
Chuck Mann, Area Sources Committee
Mohammed Mazeed, Projections Committee
Ethan McMahon, Greenhouse Gases
Herb Sherrow, Steering Committee
Greg Stella, Projections Committee
Lee Tooly, Data Management Committee
Garry Brooks, ERG
Linda Cooper, ERG

GENERAL UPDATES

Reports on the progress and status of each of the working committees were presented by one of the co-chairs of each committee.

Point Sources Committee

Steve Bromberg reported for Dennis Beauregard who was away on vacation, and noted that Dennis has put in for a work assignment (WA) modification for additional work through most of this fiscal year (FY). Steve asked if Toch Mangat had submitted the Rule Effectiveness paper, and Linda Cooper responded that Theresa Moody had received it and requested it be edited. Steve and Toch spoke at the recent AIRS conference, and Toch acknowledged the paper addressed some contentious issues. Garry Brooks asked Steve about the status of the WA modification because nothing had been received and the current one expires June 1. Steve responded that although Dennis was due back around June 1, Garry should call Kathy Weant or him if it did not arrive soon. (Subsequent to the call, the WA modification was received and work is continuing.)

Area Sources Committee

Chuck Mann reported that this committee had their conference call the previous week. The chapters on open burning and asphalt paving are nearly ready for external review. For the open burning chapter section on municipal waste burning, their ERG contractor Lucy Adams had contacted Steve about getting EFIG review of the emission factors. After this and any other issues are resolved, this chapter should be ready for external review. In addition, regarding the

asphalt paving chapter, use of the per capita emission factors does not give realistic results and does not make sense for the categories of cutback or emulsified asphalt. Per capita factors have been removed from the asphalt paving chapter. Industry trade group external reviewers are being arranged for this chapter. Regarding the chapter on petroleum vessel loading/unloading, Steve should have received the Adobe Acrobat file to be posted on the EIIP web page. Steve asked about the status of this committee's technical abstracts. Chuck responded that they want to do more and plan to and have candidate topics ready when they get their funding.

Quality Assurance Committee

Bill Kuykendal reported that ERG produced a white paper for this committee on validation/verification issues. QAC members will review it and, depending on their feedback, will forward it to the Steering Committee with either recommendations to consider further or that no techniques appear fruitful. He noted that the agenda item on budget issues was relevant and specifically if the Steering Committee would reserve any funds for further work on this topic. Also, Garry Brooks reminded Bill that the WA authorized for this effort expires on May 29, and he may want to extend the timeframe of the WA if the QAC will not complete this effort by then. Bill responded that he would extend the timeframe because he knew the committee would not finish this before May 29.

Data Management Committee

Lee Tooly reported that the DMC has completed the prototype demonstration of data transfer and electronic data interchange (EDI) for California and Pennsylvania, and their contractor is writing up the results. The DMC has already moved into Phase 2 with the data model and have retained ERG as their contractor on this effort. They are collaborating with another EPA group in DC on this effort. Lee noted that the Phase 2 goals may be realized by this project. They are also looking at Phase 1 and doing a comparative analysis to determine how well this will work for industry reporting to states. In addition, they have considered and decided upon papers to present at the December AWMA conference: one on the EDI prototype results and another on the Phase 2 Data Model Study.

PM-Fines Committee

Steve relayed that he spoke with Tom Pace and learned that this committee had gotten their group together, but that they will not do much until they get funding. Steve expects to have more information next month from this group and will discuss funding for this year with Tom Pace.

Projections Committee

Mohammed Mazeed reported that this committee had discussed two issues. The first was the question of using actual versus allowable growth factors. They determined that because actual data were hard to get, allowable growth factors would be used in predictions. The second issue discussed was growth factors for electric utilities. No consensus was reached on this issue.

Because of impending deregulation, they do not know where in the country growth will occur, therefore, growth factors are highly questionable. They did identify New York and states in the Ozone Transport Region that are capping emissions from utilities, thereby directly affecting growth rates. Steve asked if they had enough direction or whether they were still in the discussion phase. Mohammed replied that it will not be easy to come up with anything new and they were still discussing information as opposed to writing documents. Steve said that a valuable contribution from this committee would be a statement about what everyone should use and why. Their next call is scheduled for June 9.

Greenhouse Gases Committee

Steve introduced Ethan McMahon, with the EPA Office of Policy Planning and Evaluation (OPPE) and specifically the State and Local Climate Change Program. This program is working with 34 states to do greenhouse gas (GHG) emission inventories, and provides technical assistance and spreadsheets to allow comparison of emissions. They also help develop voluntary plans to reduce emissions. He works with Wiley Barbour in a sister OPPE group who works on national inventories and is working toward consistency in international, national, and state and local methods in conjunction with the International Programme on Climate Change (IPCC). Ethan's first big task is getting inputs from states on methods to improve quality and get more comprehensive data and, second, to incorporate GHGs into other EIIP committees' chapters, especially those of the Area and Point Sources Committees, with hopes that not much additional effort will be needed.

Their current focus is on the state workbook. They have applied DARS to current preferred and alternative methods. They have formed subcommittees representing several sectors including: energy, agricultural methane, other methane sources, and forests and non-CO₂ emissions from mobile sources. Ten states are involved as are other EPA groups in the Office of Air and Radiation as well as EPA's Office of Research and Development. Currently they are trying to figure out how to get industry input, particularly review of materials by the subcommittees. Then they will request review by EIIP members and industry. Steve recommended asking the EIIP Point and Area Sources Committees about how they have been getting and using industry comments. Their percentage of state and local agency participation is fairly high with the ten states involved, and most have done emission inventories.

Ethan noted that for their workbook project, the focus is on state-level emissions, not those from specific facilities or sources. Their goal is to first revise their workbook to parallel EIIP documents. Then they plan to work more closely with other EIIP committees to incorporate GHG information, particularly into the Point and Area Sources chapters. Ethan commented that they have been getting calls from industry about how to incorporate emission factors for GHG emissions. He expects they will use the state guidance available, and then Point Sources Committee guidance. Steve asked Ethan if he had a sense about states' willingness to do inventories. Ethan responded that about two-thirds of states had completed them and ones by three more states and Puerto Rico are underway. He noted that states often have their inventory work done by universities to keep costs low. Also, 24 states are preparing voluntary reduction plans for GHGs.

SCC Subcommittee

At the AIRS conference, Steve presented the group's recommendations. The response to the presentation was fairly positive. The next step for this subcommittee will be to determine how the new coding system will be implemented. They are shooting for implementation by the end of the calendar year.

OTHER BUSINESS

FY98 Funding

Steve reported that the FY98 funds finally showed up, but no one explained why it took 8 months for the funds to arrive. Regarding plans on how to spend the funds, the first objective is to fund all committees at a reasonable rate for this year and then to roll the rest of the funds over so they can be used for the following year. Steve plans to follow up with all committees by the end of the following week to determine where to place their funding, including addressing activity for FY99 so funds are available then. He noted there is some pressure to get the funds "off the books" fairly quickly.

ISSUE OF THE MONTH

Steve began this topic by reviewing last month's discussion about background/reference documentation for EIIP chapters. They agreed not to use the same system as in place for AP-42, but to use full reference citations for common documents that are easily obtained. For obscure documents and ones not published or hard to obtain, as well as for records of internal decisions or for personal communications for which Steve emphasized the importance of having a paper trail, the actual document or record should be obtained and could be included in EIIP Volume VIII, Bibliography. Steve noted they can look at scanning such documents if the volume warrants this and asked Garry Brooks about what he found. Garry responded that the final tally was not ready yet but he would get back to Steve on this. Steve stated that the Steering Committee will fund current efforts for this, but in the future each committee must fund this effort. Steve added that such documents could be included on the CD prepared and sent out each year.

The new topic discussed this month was suggested by Dennis Beauregard: How much longer will EIIP function? Steve first referred to the events of the last few months about receiving funding. He noted that STAPPA/ALAPCO asked how much longer should EIIP get funding. From comments made at the December EIIP meeting, EIIP funding is included in budgets for

FY99 and FY2000 at STAPPA/ALAPCO and EPA at half the current rate. Steve noted that at the end of FY2000, EIIP as we know it will end and we will declare victory. He posed the questions, Is EIIP needed in the future? and What does the community need? Early in the next fiscal year, EIIP participants will ask if EIIP needs to continue. If the response is positive, a proposal will be developed to request new funding from STAPPA/ALAPCO for FY2001. If not, we will draw the line and conclude. Steve noted that a fair amount of work is needed during the next fiscal year. Also, depending on what is decided about EIIP's future, another question will be, What happens to the work done so far? Where will it reside? Who maintains it? Will any legitimate follow-on work be needed? Steve concluded this discussion by noting that EIIP is funded in budgets for the next 2 years at a reduced rate, and because of this, there is a need to start looking beyond this timeframe.

STEERING COMMITTEE

The next EIIP teleconference call was scheduled for Tuesday, June 23, at 3 p.m. EDT. The call-in number is (919) 541-4328. Steve also asked a general question about whether calls should continue on a monthly basis or perhaps change to bimonthly, especially in the summer when absences are more frequent. This will be addressed next month.



EIIP TELECONFERENCE MINUTES
Research Triangle Park, North Carolina
June 23, 1998

ATTENDEES

Wiley Barbour, Greenhouse Gases
Dennis Beauregard, Point Sources Committee
Steve Bromberg, Steering Committee
Chuck Mann, Area Sources Committee
Mohammed Mazeed, Projections Committee
Ethan McMahon, Greenhouse Gases
Tom Pace, PM-Fines Committee
Greg Stella, Projections Committee
Roger Westman, Steering Committee
Garry Brooks, ERG
Linda Cooper, ERG

GENERAL UPDATES

Reports on the status and progress of active committees were given, followed by discussion of general interest items.

Area Sources Committee

Chuck Mann reported that this committee had their conference call the previous week. He first reviewed the status of their products. The chapter on asphalt paving will go out soon for external review, which will include industry representatives. An external review draft of the chapter on open burning was distributed the week before, and EFIG asked they hold off on further distribution because of policy issues. Chuck noted that work was progressing on the accidental fires chapter, but problems similar to those encountered for open burning are possible. Chuck has been invited to attend an EFIG meeting on this. He added that agricultural and prescribed burning were their most sensitive topics and he doubts any similar problems will arise with their other category chapters.

The committee also discussed how they would use their remaining resources. They plan to prepare responses to frequently asked questions (FAQs) and start a number of documents on small area sources, which they envision as one- or two-page abstracts. They have identified a number of categories to address. Chuck posed a question to the Steering Committee: What kind of review for these documents is appropriate or necessary? He noted that the Area Sources Committee thought the Steering Committee and the ASC should review these, but thought no extended external review was necessary. They will try to send them to targeted industry or trade groups for review and plan to announce their availability to the external community via the Web site. They would like Steering Committee feedback and Chuck asked if this approach would be

acceptable. Steve responded that in the past they have tried to get external review, and recommended posting such documents on the EIIP website as drafts so anyone can comment if they wish. Steve will make sure internal review occurs from a policy standpoint.

Projections Committee

Mohammed Mazeed made the report for this committee, but noted they had had no call this month. He indicated that the committee is looking for states to volunteer to provide funding for upgrading the Economic Growth Analysis System (EGAS) model. They hope to convince states it is in their interest to invest money to improve the system for projections purposes. Mohammed said the committee has estimated a need of approximately \$50,000 to upgrade EGAS. Roger Westman asked if they had identified prospective states that might contribute. Mohammed responded yes, but they have not heard anything yet. Roger said that getting funds from 105 grants was unlikely and he would be surprised if states provided funding through this mechanism.

Greenhouse Gases Committee

Ethan McMahon reported that they had been working on developing their Web site and that it looks like the EIIP site, but it must still be linked to the EIIP site. Users can read meeting minutes and the committee's mission statement. At their last meeting, the committee's contractor (ICF) was asked to incorporate new GHG emissions estimation methods into EPA's "State Workbook" document. They were asked to incorporate both methods developed for the current national U.S. GHG inventory and applicable methods put out by the Intergovernmental Panel of Climate Change (IPCC) that would be feasible for use by states. Steve asked if their State Workbook had been revised and Wiley Barbour indicated that it would be. Currently, ICF is reformatting the materials to be consistent with the EIIP style. Wiley said the document is not yet ready for review but they hoped to have a package soon to send to EIIP members. Following EIIP concurrence, the document could be posted on the Web site. Wiley added that the GHG group has been applying the DARS to GHG inventories with good success. He will keep the co-chairs group informed on their progress.

PM-Fines Committee

Tom Pace noted their second meeting was scheduled for later in the week. Their committee is reviewing a draft outline of a white paper on emission estimating tools. They have 8 to 10 participants on their committee, and others on their reviewer list.

Point Sources Committee

Dennis Beauregard reported that they were moving ahead with their work and have made progress on Rule Effectiveness (RE). They have made progress on and are nearing completion of their work on the RE paper, which is undergoing review to be finalized. They hope to submit it to the Steering Committee before the next scheduled phone call. Under the new task, "Determining Emission Estimates During Malfunctions and Upsets," the Point Sources

Committee (PSC) has received example standard reporting forms from state and local agencies, and actual data from the Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission (TNRCC). The PSC will characterize the types of information available and develop a guidance document for those who may want to use these data to adjust inventory numbers. Also, they have completed their documents on secondary metals processing (Chapter 9) and stone mining and quarrying (Chapter 13), both of which are posted on the EIIP website. Work on other documents is still underway on semiconductors, oil and gas field production, and plastics product manufacturing, for which no AP-42 sections exist. They hope to complete these by the end of the fiscal year. They are considering work on wood products, but it is unlikely they will have the resources to do much on this before the end of the fiscal year.

Quality Assurance Committee

Steve reported for Bill Kuykendal, who was away on vacation, that the committee is reviewing a white paper on validation/verification issues and needs to decide if more work should be done. A work assignment is being processed for work to continue into the next fiscal year, so this committee will be operating again.

OTHER BUSINESS

Funding

Steve reported that if EIIP is to be supported for FY99 he anticipates procedures and the timeframe for receiving funds to be no different from that for FY98. He expects EPA as well as STAPPA/ALAPCO to include funding for EIIP for FY99 and 2000 although funding levels would be reduced from what they are now. The actual funds delivery process is slated to change for FY99, which has unknown implications. He recommended that committees be aware of this situation and be prepared to develop a back-up plan. In the past, EIIP has gotten funding “off the top” before Section 105 grant funds were distributed, but this will change in FY99. All grant funds will have to go to state and local agencies who must match them before returning them to EIIP. Steve noted that especially if the funds must be matched before being returned, this raises a lot of questions, such as what if some agencies do participate and others do not. There are many scenarios that could develop. No one at EPA or STAPPA/ALAPCO is happy about these procedures. Steve is trying to find out more details about the new procedure and hopes to know more before the next co-chairs call.

If this works as described, EIIP needs a plan to inform the state air directors about why the EIIP should continue and why funds should be passed back to EPA. This potentially will affect every state and local agency in the country. Steve would appreciate suggestions from others if anyone has ideas on how to pursue this.

As a starting point for FY99, a lot of funds allocated for FY98 will be used to fund work in FY99. In the short-term (i.e., next 6 months), EIIP will continue operating as it is now. If it is determined that FY99 funding is unlikely, current funds will be used to wind down program efforts. In light of the budget situation, members must start addressing what will happen to EIIP products in the future, including who will maintain guidance documents and the data model.

AWMA Conference

Steve asked about whether to have an EIIP booth at the December AWMA emission inventory specialty conference in New Orleans. Last year, there was not a lot of traffic, so there is the question of whether it is wise to spend about \$1000. Steve and others commented that it may be useful to have a booth to display the EIIP documents and logo. Roger responded that it is important to keep EIIP's name in circulation. Steve agreed and added that there were usually enough participants attending to staff it. Chuck asked about displaying a poster instead of just documents. Steve responded that that could be done with one panel addressing document status. Garry suggested they consider a poster if there is not an EIIP session, which would be a cheaper way to convey EIIP progress. Giving away post-it notes with the EIIP logo left over from last year is also an option.

Recognition

Steve noted that the latest issue of the journal *Environmental Management* included a article about Roger who mentions EIIP, and added that this is a nice honor.

STEERING COMMITTEE

The next EIIP teleconference call was scheduled for Tuesday, August 25, at 3 p.m. EDT. The call-in number is (919) 541-4328. Steve noted that the only reason to have the call sooner would be if there were budget issues to discuss. He also asked a general question about whether calls should continue on a monthly basis or perhaps change to bimonthly, especially in the summer when getting a quorum is hard and absences are more frequent. This will be addressed at the next call.



EIIP TELECONFERENCE MINUTES
Research Triangle Park, North Carolina
October 20, 1998

ATTENDEES

Bob Betterton, Point Sources Committee
Dennis Beauregard, Point Sources Committee
Steve Bromberg, Steering Committee
Roy Huntley, Point Sources Committee
Bill Kuykendal, Quality Assurance Committee
Carolyn Lozo, Area Sources Committee
Chuck Mann, Area Sources Committee
Mohammed Mazeed, Projections Committee
Greg Stella, Projections Committee
Ethan McMahon, Greenhouse Gases Committee
Tom Pace, PM-2.5 Committee
Garry Brooks, ERG
Linda Cooper, ERG

GENERAL UPDATES

Reports on the status and progress of active committees were given, followed by discussion of general interest items.

Point Sources Committee

Bob Betterton, the new state co-chair, gave his first report for this committee. They have completed committee discussions on the rule effectiveness (RE) paper and sent it to Steve Bromberg for Steering Committee review. Steve noted that it was posted for comment on the EIIP World Wide Web site. Bob reported they also discussed a guidance paper on process upset and malfunction information, which was the original intent of the RE discussion and paper. He noted that ERG will draft a technical assessment paper (TAP) to provide guidance on estimating emissions during upset conditions. Their contractor, Theresa Moody, incorporated data received from Texas and Illinois and he recently sent her South Carolina information. Bob updated his committee on the work of the projections and PM-2.5 committees. Dennis Beauregard reported on the PSC's progress on guidance documents. Extensive changes to Chapter 6 (semiconductor manufacturing) were incorporated and it was sent out in September for a second external review. Dennis added that he is helping the new EPA co-chair Roy Huntley with this chapter since this work was started while he was co-chair. Chapter 10 (oil and gas field production) will be sent for a second external review after comments from the first review are incorporated. Chapter 11 (plastic products manufacturing) is undergoing a second external review. Comments are expected mid-November. Chapter 12 (wood products manufacturing) and Chapter 14 (graphic arts and printing) are currently on hold; Chapter 13 (stone mining and quarrying) is final. In addition, Bob

reported that their committee is considering potential topics to start new chapters from a list of candidates ERG prepared consisting of inorganic chemical manufacturing, organic chemical manufacturing, pharmaceutical preparations, and synthetic rubber manufacturing.

Dennis added that they discussed how to modify existing documents on their committee's last call. They expect to add something to each document as a result of the work of the Projections and PM-2.5 Committees. They also expect to update their source category list for FY99, as well as review the draft work products of the other committees, especially those for PM-2.5. He noted that the PSC is ready for suggestions from the PM-2.5 Committee because most expertise on that topic is in that committee, not theirs. He anticipates the Area Sources Committee may be facing similar questions.

Area Sources Committee

Chuck Mann reported on progress for this committee. They have received industry review comments on their external review draft of the asphalt paving document and will finalize it. For their chapters on open burning and wildfires, the sections on agriculture and forestry that were controversial were removed and these documents can now undergo OAQPS policy review to be finalized. The chapter on structural fires has undergone internal committee review and is being prepared for external review. Carolyn Lozo, their state co-chair, added that they are working on finalizing the chapter on autobody refinishing. Chuck noted that he had received a contractor's report on this topic that was independent of EIIP. It contained no new breakthroughs, but he hopes to turn this into an Office of Research and Development (ORD) report, although this will take some time. He expects they will want to modify the draft EIIP document on this topic, but anticipates no major changes and the committee will work on this over the next three months. Steve asked how they planned to update this document and this might be a good precedent for this process in EIIP. However, Chuck noted their earlier draft had never been finalized previously, so the updating/maintenance issue will still need to be addressed. They have also made progress on their area source methods abstract documents on vehicle fires, charbroiling, and residential/commercial fuel combustion and started ones on asphalt roofing, bakeries, leaking underground storage tanks, and catastrophic/accidental releases. Also, their draft list of answers to frequently asked questions (FAQs) is now undergoing committee review after which they plan to send it to other committees for review. Their next conference call will be the next day.

Quality Assurance Committee

Bill Kuykendal reported that this committee's only activity was adding a chapter to their volume on verification/validation issues. A draft is still undergoing committee review, and a call has been scheduled for mid-November to discuss it. Steve asked if the QA Committee was doing more beyond this. Bill responded that they had no recommendations yet, but there might be potential for resurrecting computerized edit checks.

PM-2.5 Committee

Tom Pace reported that this committee posted a draft paper on the EIIP Web site in late September on the state of the science on PM-2.5 inventories. They are currently seeking comments and awaiting feedback on the document, as well as on the principal charter of the group. He anticipates finalizing the state of science paper in November or December. Steve asked about their plans after that. Tom replied that they have not scheduled future calls and asked what else should they do.

Projections Committee

Greg Stella reported that this group has had two calls since the last co-chairs call. On the first, they organized available guidance by major topic. On the second, they discussed the status of their contractor's collection of projections information for major source categories on activities, models, and major source category projections methods. They are reviewing categories source by source to identify potential activities and methods they can collect. They are also investigating controls and RE for emission estimation for production of state implementation plans to determine how controls and RE play a part in projections. In addition, they are reviewing a nonroad sector first that they see as a middle ground because it had the least amount of data. Their next call will be the following week. Steve noted that this issue will be very important and Greg is aware that the inventory community really needs this information.

Greenhouse Gases Committee

Ethan McMahon reported that they had been working on their chapters, expect to have 14 in their volume, and plan to post 12 of these on the EIIP web site so EIIP participants can review and comment on them. Steve asked if they were in EIIP format, and Ethan responded yes, that they may be in ".PDF" format. Steve noted they will post the greenhouse gas (GHG) chapters on the EIIP Web site and that a list server notice would go to about 6000 people. Steve also asked what they would be doing next, and Ethan replied they wanted to incorporate GHG emission inventory methods into other committees' chapters. For example, the Point Source Committee's boiler chapter addresses emissions of nitrogen oxides and carbon monoxide, but not carbon dioxide. Steve noted that might be the first test of updating completed EIIP documents. Steve also asked about the status of this group's finding for FY99 since its operating budget does not come from the EIIP. Ethan indicated that he is unsure of where FY99 funding for the committee stands.

Data Management Committee

Steve noted that Lee Tooly was in training but she had reported at the last call that this committee's work was done and all their work products were posted on the EIIP Web site.

OTHER BUSINESS

FY99 Funding

Steve reported that EIIP was in a lot better shape than last year at this time. All state and local agency members of STAPPA/ALAPCO had to vote on EIIP funding and almost all voted to continue it. Per the agreement with STAPPA/ALAPCO, EIIP will get the same amount of funding as last year (\$675K) plus unspent funds will be rolled over, so EIIP is in good shape. All committees have active work and are funded till the new FY99 money arrives.

EIIP Updates

Steve noted that he had previously decided to delay this work till the funding came through. The last *Update* was done in September 1997, which was a longer delay than had been anticipated. He said it was time to restart this effort and he wanted to get one issue done and out before the end of the year. He anticipates its focus would be to remind the inventory community about EIIP--who we are and what we're about. He wants all the committees to summarize their work for the past year as well as report on any new ideas and directions, which he anticipated would be about a half page of material each. All committees should e-mail a half-page write-up to Steve by November 6 so a new issue can be distributed in December. He will ask ERG to do a table of contents for all EIIP documents and include those that are not yet final. Steve will handle the bureaucratic part of this. He plans to print about 400 copies for managers and administrators but also post it on the EIIP Web site and send a list server notice for other readers. He envisions that future *Update* issues will feature the new committees and explain their missions and future plans.

SAEWG Meeting

Steve reported on the highlights of this meeting in Salt Lake City where the Standing Air Emissions Work Group (SAEWG) met. One issue raised was how EIIP will deal with the Aerometric Information Retrieval System (AIRS) and AIRS Facility Subsystem (AFS) going away and how this impacts Data Management Committee plans. For almost 1 year, AIRS personnel have been working with direct users. They have developed a clearinghouse that will be linked to the EIIP Web site in about 2 weeks. One question raised was, should EIIP act as a clearinghouse for documents or new ideas? Who is in the best position to do this? A small group was formed to address this question. Steve recommended that each committee spend 1-2 hours on this and look at the literature for new ideas and publications related to EIIP's charge. He posed the following questions to consider: Who should do the clearinghouse with a bibliography for interested individuals? What is the best way to do it? Should contractors be involved?

EIIP's Future

Steve raised more general questions, such as What should EIIP's future be like? How should documents be maintained long term? What areas need to be improved? How can EIIP reach out better to make ideas more accessible? Regarding data transfer in general, he noted that standardizing data collection and transfer is needed as well as making sure the procedures work. Also, dealing with hazardous air pollutants will be a big issue in the future. EIIP has not taken a position on this. Even though EIIP has received year-to-year funding, Steve expects EIIP will end in 2000 and declare victory. He recommends developing a survey for STAPPA/ALAPCO members with the idea of continuing current work but also addressing new items or issues to address. Steve will draft the survey form and envisions this being distributed at the next STAPPA/ALAPCO meeting in May.

AWMA Emission Inventory Conference

Steve addressed EIIP's presence at the December conference. He will work with ERG to get a poster done for that session and plans to present a summary of documents. He also expects to have a booth with handouts that will feature the three new committees on PM-2.5, projections, and GHGs. He wants committees' input and their members to staff the booth. He asked all committees to check with their members and find out who plans to attend and seek volunteers to help staff the booth. Please send names to Steve or have members planning to attend contact Steve directly.

STEERING COMMITTEE

The next EIIP teleconference call was scheduled for Tuesday, December 15, at 3 p.m. EST, which will be after the AWMA conference so there may be input or feedback to report. If there is no pressing business, he may postpone the call till January but he will follow up to determine if there is a need to get together. The call-in number is (919) 541-4328.